

LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT HON. LORD KENYON

ON THE

APPLICATIONS NOW MAKING IN BEHALF OF VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS

CONNECTED WITH THE

Protestant Episcopal Church

IN THE

UNITED STATES.

MY LORD,

THE Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has found in your Lordship so sincere a friend, that nothing, I am persuaded, would give you more pleasure than to be instrumental in promoting its interests. In becoming a Trustee of the Funds, now raising in this Country in behalf of three distinct objects connected with that Church, your Lordship manifestly considers those objects as perfectly consistent with one another. The parties concerned in those applications—Bishop Hobart, of New-York, for the General Theological Seminary of the American Episcopal Church; Bishop Chase, of Ohio, for the Theological Seminary for his Diocese; and Bishop Brownell, of Connecticut, by his Agent, the Rev. N. S. Wheaton, for an Episcopal College in Connecticut—have happily agreed, though some differences of opinion did exist, to refer their respective objects to the benevolent consideration of the people of this country, and more especially to that of the Members of the Established Church. This mutual agreement is sufficiently explained and established, in a Circular, issued by the Trustees of a Fund raising in behalf of the Theological Seminary in Ohio, and in another issued by those of a joint Fund raising in behalf of the General Seminary and the Connecticut College; and is further manifested in that your Lordship and the Rev. Dr. Gaskin are Trustees of both Funds, in co-operation, with respect to that for Ohio, with Lord Gambier and Mr. Henry Hoare, and, with respect to the other, with Mr. Joshua Watson and Mr. George Wharton Marriot.

Your Lordship is aware, in some measure, by what steps this most desirable state of concord was effected: but, as some painful circumstances threaten greatly to weaken, if not to destroy, the ultimate and hoped-for effect of this agreement, your Lordship will allow me, as having had constant intercourse with all the parties from the first, to state such particulars as may seem necessary to an adequate understanding of the whole case; for the temper at present cherished, by a few of the professed advocates in this country of the American Episcopal Church, and by some of its members in the United States, threatens that Church with the greatest calamity which could befall it—internal discord and division, and consequent contempt and ruin.

It is not my purpose in this Letter to say a word more than the real interests of the American Episcopal Church appear to me to require. I cannot trust myself to characterize the manner in which a Bishop of primitive simplicity has been insulted in private, or calumniated by the press: but I am bound to say, that those insults and calumnies are confined to a very small number of persons, who will themselves come, I trust, when they have thoroughly examined the case, to a better mind. But I cannot withhold from Bishop Chase the tribute of my esteem and reverence, for that truly dignified and Christian course which he has pursued among us. Having determined, in full concurrence with the judgment and wishes of his friends, at all risks to maintain the character of a man of peace, and to return without accomplishing his object rather than to carry on a conflict in this country to the disparagement of the American Church, he has, in the face of much misunderstanding and misrepresentation, strictly adhered to his determination: and I cannot but hope, that the avoiding of controversy in this country, and the arrangements which have been made among the once-opposing parties, will lead to the amicable adjustment of all differences in America, as Bishop Chase most anxiously wishes.

For it cannot be concealed, that the attacks made on Bishop Chase in this country have led to a violent conflict in America. The Wardens and Vestry of Christ Church, Cincinnati, in the Diocese of Ohio, had published a Declaration and Protest against Bishop Hobart's proceedings, in America, in opposition to Bishop Chase's visit to England. A "Presbyter of the Diocese of New-York," has answered the Declaration and Protest, and subjoined Bishop Hobart's Notes and other documents issued in this country. The Periodical Works, connected with the Episcopal Church, take their respective sides in the question; while those belonging to other Communions attentively watch the controversy. The preponderance of judgment and feeling is decidedly in favour of Bishop Chase's objects and proceedings; and when the conduct of that Right Rev. Prelate in this country comes to be fully known, none, I will venture to say, but those whose prepossessions prevent them from yielding to the claims of truth and justice, will regard him otherwise than with the highest veneration and esteem. The "Presbyter," in his zeal to condemn Bishop Chase, has more severely condemned Bishop Hobart. He censures the appeals of Bishop Chase and Bishop Brownell for "FOREIGN AID" as utterly disgraceful to the American Church. Bishop Chase, indeed, is dealt moderately with, as only asking for his own Diocese; but Bishop Brownell is thus censured—"Your Bishop, indeed," (speaking of Bishop Chase,) "is satisfied with implicating, in his share of this procedure, but a part of the Church in the United States—although it is the Church in the largest portion of those States. But his distant coadjutors" (meaning Bishop Brownell and his friends,) "hesitate not to implicate, in their scheme, the whole—THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES!" And yet the same "Presbyter" quotes, in his Publication, a passage which shows that he knew that Bishop Hobart was "exhibiting" in England, "the paramount claims of the General Theological Seminary to patronage!" And what will this hasty partisan say, when he finds Bishop Hobart uniting with Bishop Brownell's Agent "in making known the GENERAL WANTS OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH for relief in this country!" I do not censure such applications: but such precipitate writers, on either side of the Atlantic, who exasperate their own spirits and those of all who listen to them, will ever deserve the severe censure of all true Christians.

Bishop Hobart's agreement with Bishop Chase, and his subsequent arrangements with Mr. Wheaton, proceeded on the principle of concession for the sake of concord. Bishop Hobart may possibly still retain his opinion on the expediency of having no Theological Seminary throughout the Episcopal Church, but the General Seminary and Branches under its control; and he is not at all restrained by any thing that has passed in England from supporting that opinion, in America, by the best arguments in his power: but I consider him as withdrawing all imputations whatever on the right of Bishop Chase and Bishop Brownell to urge their respective objects, and as discountenancing all imputations on the rectitude and piety of their motives in so urging them.

And here the matter would have rested, so far as this country is concerned; and our American Friends would have returned home with the conscious satisfaction of having experienced mutual kindness, and with the strong motive for cultivating peace at home derived from the healing spirit which they had witnessed here. But other persons have unhappily interfered, and seem determined to keep alive the torch of discord. Some copies of "Presbyter's" pamphlet arrived at the moment when concord had been established, and an avowal of such concord put forth by the parties. The friends of the American Church determined to act on the spirit of this agreement, and to suppress the copies of this pamphlet. But the Editor of the British Critic, having possession of a copy, seems to have taken up a resolution to frustrate such intention; for, in defiance of the adjustment which the parties most nearly concerned had formed, he drags forward this painful subject to public notice, in an Article in the Number for May, which discovers a spirit so entirely unchristian, and abounds in representations and assertions so utterly unfounded, that the interests of the English Church, equally with those of the American, require that the true character of that article should be exposed.

It is painful to be obliged, in vindication of the cause of truth, to recur to any of those matters of which Bishop Chase has had just cause to complain; but they will be recurred to by me, only so far as the vindication of Bishop Chase renders it unavoidable.

From all knowledge of an intention to offer such violence to truth and justice as appears in the British Critic, Bishop Hobart and the Agent of Bishop Brownell must be entirely exonerated. Almost immediately after the points in discussion had been adjusted, Bishop Hobart proceeded to the Continent, where he still remains; and would disdain to act in violation of a settled compact: while Mr. Wheaton severely condemns and censures every remark of the Reviewer in relation to Bishop Chase. What, then, are the readers of the British Critic to think of this writer, who acts thus the part of a Minister of Discord, and not of Peace!

I will notice the charges brought by this writer with as much brevity as is consistent with the necessary vindication of Bishop Chase; with this intimation, however, that the more the examination of this whole business shall be carried into detail, the more strongly will the claims of Ohio, and the character and proceedings of Bishop Chase, commend themselves to the cordial regard of all candid and benevolent men.

While addressing your Lordship, the post has brought me a copy of a printed "Letter from the Wardens and Vestry of Christ Church, Cincinnati." This Letter is dated on the 17th of April, and contains a full, able, and temperate discussion on the main questions at issue; and is a

complete refutation of the pamphlet of "Presbyter," in a spirit very different from his own. Were it not that the statements of this Letter enter into details which it is now our duty in this country to avoid, I should probably have instantly laid aside my pen, and have rested the vindication of Bishop Chase on the powerful reasonings of the able friends which defend his cause in America, and are under his own Spiritual Charge. Some extracts from their Letter will, however, be given; as they place several points on which I shall have to touch in a striking light.

The PRESERVATION OF THE UNITY OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH, is the avowed object of the Critic, and the alleged ground of his opposition to the establishment of the Ohio Seminary.

I join issue hereon with this Gentleman; and assert that the unity of the American Church *is in danger from the course which he and the very few who act with him adopt*—and that it is in danger from that quarter only.

In the prosecution of his purpose to fix on Bishop Chase the stigma of Disunion, the Critic brings very serious charges, affecting even the character of Bishop Chase, every one of which is refuted by undoubted facts! What then are we to think, My Lord, of a writer who ventures thus to commit the reputation of a work which has hitherto claimed some authority; and who indulges in sneers and invectives, so completely beside the course of one who with Christian seriousness wishes to ascertain and state the truth, and especially on a subject involving the character of a distinguished Prelate of the Church, that they can be noticed only with shame and sorrow!

It is alleged that Bishop Chase's "*scheme has been discountenanced by the American Church*;" and yet no attempt is made to support this charge, but by the assertion, that a majority of the Bishops of that Church disapprove it. It is not a fact that a majority of the Bishops have disapproved the plan; but even if it were, yet the whole House of Bishops itself does not constitute the American Church. That Church can express its sentiments only by the concurrence of the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in General Convention assembled.

It may be said, perhaps, that the disapprobation of such of his Brethren as have discountenanced the plan affords a strong presumption against the propriety of Bishop Chase's measures. But what, in this question, is the real amount and weight of such disapprobation? The inquiry cannot be better answered than in the words of a Periodical Writer in America, in the April Number of a work which I have just received, and which claims the more attention as it emanates in New-York, from one of those Communions which are now in America watching the progress of this painful question in the Episcopal Church, and exercising an independent judgment thereon.

Every Diocese, and therefore Ohio among the rest, has the indisputable right to establish Diocesan Theological Schools or Seminaries unconnected with the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church; which right has been established beyond controversy by the General Convention's having sanctioned and acknowledged the local school founded by the Convention of the Church in the State of New-York, under circumstances which, if any could, were peculiarly calculated to call forth its disapprobation and reprehension; and the Church in Ohio, having established a Missionary Society, and resolved on founding a Diocesan Theological Seminary, was the best qualified to judge, and was altogether competent to decide, on the question of the means to be employed for the carrying of these important plans into effect.

The circumstance of their Bishop having applied to his brethren for counsel, did not concede to them the right to dictate, nor deprive him of the right to act. It was application for advice on a difficult, interesting, and highly important subject. This advice was withheld, or at least did not come to hand, from May to September; until after the church in Ohio, from the urgency of her situation, had formed her determination, and her representative had made all his arrangements, and was actually on his way to take his departure. To relinquish, then, was not left to his choice. The appointment had been made. Every thing had been put to hazard. And all that then remained was, to proceed, be the issue what it might. Does it not seem cruel, in such circumstances, to raise the standard of opposition! Would it not have been better, and in every way more in accordance with the "bowels of Christian mercy," to have left him unmolested to make the experiment, unannoyed with other opposing difficulties than such as would inevitably arise? [*Christian Herald*, No. 248, pp. 237, 238.]

But Bishop Chase is charged with *concealing the fact of the opposition of his brethren to his plans, and he is opprobriously said to have done this "with more ingenuity than candour."*

Is it to be tolerated, My Lord, that an individual, hiding himself under the shelter of an anonymous publication, shall thus slander a Prelate of the Church? At the very moment that he makes this charge, he contradicts himself; for he quotes a passage from his coadjutor the "Presbyter," which allows that Bishop Chase *did* announce the opposition of some of his brethren. But then "he carefully avoids informing the public what their objections were." Indeed! Those few persons, My Lord, in this country who have seen Bishop Chase's Letter to Bishop White have been struck with the dignified simplicity and magnanimity of his proceedings, in their printing, at length and without a single remark, a letter from Bishop Hobart to himself, urging, with all that force of which Bishop Hobart is so capable, the various objections against the measure. And it was natural to expect, as Bishop Hobart was the main opponent of the plan, and the objections of the other Bishops were derived chiefly from him, that all the strength of the case would appear in this Letter. And this is the fact.—"Presbyter" accuses Bishop Chase, and the Critic quotes the accusation, of "throwing aside, as unworthy of notice," a Letter of Bishop White's, "containing strong objections by Bishops White, Hobart, Croes, and Brownell:" when there is not a single objection in this letter which is not substantially urged in the Letter of Bishop Hobart which Bishop Chase printed in his Appendix; and, let me add, placed therein in a more forcible point of view: and it would have been far more favourable to Bishop Chase's cause to print that Letter, for the venerable writer therein declares that he moves in this business entirely at the suggestion of others—

Learning that our brethren, Bishops Hobart, Croes, and Brownell, are desirous that there should be brought before you some further considerations, and that they should be transmitted through me, and agreeing with them in sentiment, I consent to become their organ. *My informant is Bishop Hobart.*

I do not state this, My Lord, to criminate any one. It is rendered necessary, in the vindication of Bishop Chase from evil surmises and misrepresentations.

Bishop Brownell must be taken from the number of the dissidents; for he expressly assures Bishop Chase (in his Letter printed in the Appendix to the Letter to Bishop White,) of his "heartly good wishes;" and says, of his visit to England, that he "cannot entertain a doubt of its successful issue."

With respect to Bishops Moore and Kemp, the "Presbyter" says, and is again quoted by the Critic—

The names of Bishops Moore and Kemp do not appear in Bishop White's Letter. As they, however, are mentioned by Bishop Chase among the brethren whose objections he so unceremoniously disregards, they are to be added to the number of those who thought with Bishop Hobart. But they, too, are not suffered to be heard, but are to be considered as of course satisfactorily answered.

All that Bishop Chase had heard or learned of the sentiments of Bishops Croes, Moore, and Kemp, was from Bishop Hobart; but of the particular nature of their objections he knew nothing. It is most obvious, therefore, that Bishop Chase not only made no attempt whatever at concealment, but that he committed his case, with all the objections which had come to his knowledge (and more he would have added, I have no doubt, had he known them,) to the calm consideration of those who might be induced to examine the subject.

What now are we to think of the "modesty," or "prudence," or "candour" of the man who attempts to defame the character of a distinguished Prelate, on such grounds, as destitute of these qualities?

While the dissent of the five Prelates before mentioned is to be received under the qualifications which the circumstance stated will suggest to every candid mind, the Letters of Bishops Bowen, Ravenscroft, and Brownell, printed in the Appendix to Bishop Chase's Letter to Bishop White, are sufficient evidence of *their* favourable regard to his objects; and Bishop Griswold supports and sanctions a Monthly Publication, which has uniformly approved his measures.

But it requires, My Lord, no spirit of prophecy to foresee that the Prelates of the American Church will be justly indignant to find their names pressed into the unholy work of degrading one of their own body. The opinion which some of them might entertain of the expediency, either of the plans of Bishop Chase, or of his measures in pursuance of them, will not make them blind to the necessity of maintaining for one another that independence which is indispensable to their character and their usefulness.

Hostility to the General Theological Seminary is, however, the charge against Bishop Chase which is mainly relied on; but it is urged, like the rest, without even any reasonable pretext. In reference to the Resolution of the House of Bishops in 1820, *not to interfere with Diocesan Schools*, the Critic, in the following unseemly manner, charges Bishop Chase with "gross misrepresentation" in bringing it forward—

That Resolution was adopted several years ago, before the General Seminary had obtained universal approbation. The separate Colleges to which it alludes have been subsequently abandoned, and the cause of the General Seminary unanimously supported by the Church. The event was hailed with gratitude and joy; and while the congratulations of the American Episcopalians upon the prospect of uninterrupted unanimity are still sounding in his ears, Bishop Chase not only counteracts their plan, but defends himself in a foreign country, where the facts of the case are little known, by appealing to a Resolution which has been abandoned, and representing it as still in force!

Your Lordship, accustomed, with many others, to attach some credit, in former times, to the statements of this work, will be surprised and grieved at the following facts.

In the British Critic for November last, the Editor proposed to give his readers an account of various American Publications; and, among the rest, of the Journal of the last General Convention of the Episcopal Church, held in May, 1823. In that Journal, there is a distinct recognition of Diocesan Schools, as then existing in the Dioceses of Maryland

and Virginia; but in the extracts relative to those two Diocesses, the Editor wholly omits the passages which relate to these Schools. Was this done with design? Must not this degrading question be answered in the affirmative, when we find the same work venturing, in May following, to declare that *all such Schools had been abandoned?*

In Virginia, a subscription had been opened, under the sanction of Bishop Moore, for the establishment of a Theological Seminary in that Diocese: and on the first day of the Meeting of the last general Convention, a Committee of Thirteen Clergymen was appointed to report concerning the state of the different Diocesses. In reference to that of Virginia, this Committee stated to the Convention, on the 4th day of its sitting—

Since the last Triennial Convention, a measure which had long been deemed of high importance to the interests of the Church in Virginia has been pressed on the attention of its members; to wit, The establishment of a Theological School in some suitable situation within the Diocese. It has pleased a gracious Providence so to bless the endeavours, that the sum of 14,000 dollars has been subscribed, a considerable part already paid, and a good prospect held out of ultimate success.

Of the Maryland Diocesan School, it is reported by the same Committee—

The Convention had, for some time past, been anxious to place within immediate reach, such facilities as might encourage the efforts of those young men, who are solicitous of being duly prepared for the high and responsible office of the Gospel Ministry. At their last meeting, in 1822, the following proposal was brought before them—"Resolved, that it is now expedient, in reliance on the blessing of God for success, to establish a local Theological Seminary." This Resolution, as appears from the recorded votes, was adopted by a very large and respectable majority of both orders. On this measure some diversity of sentiment has existed. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies refrain from the expression of any opinion upon the measure.

From whatever cause this suppression of facts and these unfounded assertions may have arisen, the work, on which they are thus justly chargeable, can no longer be trusted.

Which now is the party on whom all competent judges will fix the charge, in reference to the Resolution of the House of Bishops, of "gross misrepresentation!" And what is to be thought of men, who hold up a Christian Bishop to contumely for alleging a falsehood, when that alleged falsehood turns out to be a fact which they themselves have endeavoured to hide? Who is it that has laboured to pervert truth "in a country where the facts of the case are little known?"

No, My Lord, this Resolution remains a standing principle of action. Nothing has been since done to repeal, alter, or modify it: and I venture to predict, that all which has passed in reference to Bishop Chase's visit to this country will tend to establish the different Diocesses in their just and proper independence as to internal regulations.

As to the bearing of this matter on the question of the Ohio Seminary, I shall quote some conclusive remarks, from the Cincinnati Letter of the 17th of April before mentioned. The Wardens and Vestry, in reference to the above extract on the Virginia School, justly observe—

This is certainly the language of approbation, not of censure. The General Convention expressed no disapprobation of the opinion expressed by the Committee: the inference is, that they approved of it. We see, therefore, that in May 1823, a Diocesan School in Virginia is not disapproved of—that the effort to establish it is, by thirteen clergymen at least, regarded as deserving the blessings of a gracious Providence. How then is it, that in September following, an effort to establish a similar School in Ohio should, among the same Clergymen, and a majority of the Bishops, "excite the deepest solicitude, and the strongest disapprobation?" The principle and the paramount claims of the General Seminary are the same in both cases. One is commended, and the other strongly disapproved. These facts would seem to contain

very strong evidence, that the opposers of Bishop Chase have not well understood themselves; and have acted upon a different ground from that which they seem to suppose, or, at least, that which they have assigned. Surely they furnish strong ground for the opinion, that the majority of the clergy, acting upon their own impressions, would not have censured Bishop Chase's plan of a Diocesan School.

Most entirely, then, do such advocates of the General Seminary as the "Presbyter" and the Critic mistake the right way of promoting its strength and efficiency, in putting forward in its behalf a claim to exclusive support. The General Convention has given it no authority whatever to urge such claim. Nothing has ever passed to deprive each Diocesan Convention of the liberty of establishing whatever Seminaries it may judge conducive to its interests, consistently with the Canons of the Church, which are of a very general nature, and prescribe only general principles. No Diocese has ever yet given up any Seminary in deference to such claim: that of New-York excepted, for which there is the obvious reason, that the General Seminary itself is now established in that Diocese.

Under such circumstances, what course could have been pursued by the advocates for the General Seminary more unlikely to obtain for it universal suffrage than that which has been pursued! Its claims were put forth in this country in an article in the British Critic for November last, on the ground of its having received authority to establish Branch Schools "whenever" and "wherever" the Trustees might think it expedient: yet the sole authority for such a statement was the following expression in the 1st Article of the Constitution—"The Trustees shall have power, from time to time, to establish one or more Branch Schools in the State of New-York, or elsewhere, to be under the superintendence and control of the said Trustees"—providing, in behalf of the Diocese of New-York, that the establishing of the General Seminary therein should not preclude the Diocese from having Branches adapted to its local wants, nor the General Seminary from establishing Branches elsewhere—but manifestly giving to that Seminary no power of compelling the establishment of its Branches, much less of interfering with the authority of the respective Dioceses to establish their own Seminaries.

But this is not the most suicidal part of the course which some of the advocates of the General Seminary have pursued. Not content with this endeavour to impress on the people of this country the idea of the authority possessed by the General Seminary to establish its Branch Schools "whenever" and "wherever" the Trustees might deem it expedient, the establishment of a Diocesan Seminary has been represented as not only implying opposition and enmity to the General Seminary, but as introducing disorder and disunion into the Church!

I ask, My Lord, as a sincere friend to the American Church in its unity and consequent energy, is this the way in which the real friends of that Church, and of its General Seminary, should have endeavoured to establish the influence of that Seminary? The minds of thinking men, in free States like those of this country and America, are not to be dragged by violence into the adoption of an opinion; and more especially where there are conflicting feelings and fears, as in the case of the General Seminary.

When I have conversed on this point with Bishop Hobart, he has fully assented to the proposition—that it was destructive to authority and influence, to attempt to hold too tight a rein: and it was in reference to this very subject, of the practicable and therefore expedient power to be claimed and exercised by the General Seminary, that the Bishop concurred in the remark. And this was in full accordance with his senti-

ments, in reference to this whole subject as applicable to his own Diocess, published in 1820, in a "Pastoral Letter" addressed to that Diocess, of which the following are extracts :—

The right of every Diocess to provide for the theological education of Candidates for Orders, subject only to the provisions of the general Canons of the Church, cannot be questioned. The ecclesiastical authority of every Diocess is responsible for the admission of persons as candidates for Holy Orders ; who, in their state of preparation are under the charge of that authority and amenable to it. It is impossible for a moment to doubt the right of any Diocess to make any arrangements which they may deem proper, in consistency with the general Canons of the Church, for the instruction and aid of Candidates for Orders who are under its charge. No act of the General Convention has ever contravened its right.

It can hardly be supposed that the various diocesses, that are or may be established throughout this immense continent, will unite in the support of one Theological Institution ; or that it will be practicable for Candidates for Orders to come to one place for instruction from all parts of the Union. The experience of a very respectable religious communion confirms this reasoning from the general principles of human nature. The Presbyterian Church has a Theological Seminary at Princeton ; but a Synod of that Church, in the western part of this State, have established one, and another is contemplated by the Synod of Tennessee.

The propriety of the General Convention legislating on the establishment and regulation of a General Seminary has been doubted by many of the best friends of the Church, and those long conversant in her concerns. The moment that body governs too much, or extends its enactments to subjects on which there are clashing views and interests, the peace and union of the Church are endangered. That the General Convention should confine its Legislation to those matters that are absolutely necessary to preserve the different parts of the church as one body, is the principle which the venerable presiding Bishop of our Church states (*Memoirs of the Episcopal Church*, p. 309) as the principle that should be strictly observed. And doubtless, in conformity with this principle, and from an apprehension of the collisions which might arise from attempts, by parties of different views, to obtain the control of the General Institution, he has always expressed his opinion in favour of provision being made, by the different Diocesses, for the education of Candidates for Orders. The very attempt to preserve unity of theological opinions by a general Institution, under the authority of the Convention, would lead to collisions and separations. Here, too, the experience of other Denominations may guide us. The Presbyterian Theological Institutions in the western part of this State, and in Tennessee, I am credibly informed, are established, by those who are not favourable, in all respects, to the theological system inculcated by the General Institution. The only practicable security for unity of theological opinion among Candidates for Orders, consists in the course of studies prescribed by the Bishops, and in the general regulations of the Convention.

This powerful reasoning applies to the case of the Ohio Seminary with much greater force than to the separate Diocesan Seminary of New-York ; as the New-York Students could have been trained in the General Seminary, when at New-Haven, with incomparably more ease and advantage than those of Ohio can in the General Seminary now it is established at New-York.

And it is quite in vain to allege that circumstances have since taken place, which invalidate this reasoning. Circumstances have, indeed, induced the New-York Convention to amalgamate its Diocesan Seminary with the General Seminary, now within the District of that Convention : but no circumstances have arisen to give the General Seminary any greater authority than it possessed at that time ; and, I will venture to say on a careful examination of the whole question, which ought to give it more authority.

As a sincere friend of that Seminary, in its practicable and legitimate authority, I lament the course which has been pursued, in reference to it, by its local supporters and injudicious advocates.

It has been further attempted to bring discredit on Bishop Chase's proposal, by the assertions, that *he objects to the establishment of a Seminary in Ohio in connexion with the General Seminary*, and that *he gives no pledge that the Course of Studies adopted in the General Seminary shall be adopted in that of Ohio*—assertions which are both directly opposed to clear and undoubted facts !

So far is Bishop Chase from objecting to the establishment of a School in connexion with the General Seminary, that he has expressed his readiness, on his own part, to give that Seminary a degree of weight and authority in his Diocese which it possesses in no other ! And so far is he from having given no pledge that the Course of Studies adopted in the General Seminary shall be adopted in Ohio, that he has given precisely the same pledge for the conformity of this Course with the Canons of the Church that the General Seminary itself has given !

The "Appeal on behalf of the Diocese of Ohio," which the Critic had before him, ought to have secured Bishop Chase from this accusation : for it states—

While thus urged, by the necessity of the case, to seek the establishment of an Institution, which should provide a supply of Clergymen for the Diocese of Ohio, an honourable anxiety is manifested on the part of that Diocese to maintain the strictest union with all other portions of the Church. The Seminary established at New-York, entitled the "General Theological Seminary," though it possesses no authority whatever to supersede such Theological Schools for each Diocese as the Authorities of the respective Dioceses may judge expedient for the supply of Ministers, yet from the advantages which it affords in respect of instruction, and from the benefits arising from concentration of force and unity of system, that Seminary prefers a powerful claim to support, and might even supersede Diocesan Seminaries, whenever local circumstances do not, as in the Diocese of Ohio, render such a step, in the judgment of the Authorities of the respective Dioceses, inexpedient and injurious.

On this subject Bishop Chase says—

"To prevent the possibility, in any future generation, of the diversion of the funds (of the School to be established in Ohio) to things foreign from the original intention, and to secure the unity of the Church to all intents of the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention, it was and is our purpose to insert in the legal Act of our Incorporation a proviso, that, on evidence of mal-application, the General Theological Institution, or the Bishops, as a Committee of that body, should be authorized by law to make inquiries, and to set things right."

But the proof of Bishop Chase's love of unity, so far as the connexion of the Ohio School with the General Seminary is to be considered as such proof, is still more triumphant. In a "Minute of Agreement," between Bishops Hobart and Chase, signed by Bishop Chase, and left by me with Bishop Hobart for his signature, it was expressly provided—

The Theological Seminary for the Diocese of Ohio shall be a Branch of the General Theological Seminary ; but its government, according to Regulations, to be drawn up by the Convention of Ohio, conformably to the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, shall be vested in the Convention of Ohio ; the House of Bishops, as a Committee of the General Theological Seminary, having a Visitation Power over the said School, and being authorized to see that it is conducted according to the approved Regulations.

The ratification of this Agreement was referred to the General Convention, the Trustees of the General Seminary, and the Convention of Ohio ; Bishops Hobart and Chase not possessing the power to render such an Agreement final and binding : but it was settled, that, in the mean time, the Ohio Subscription should proceed, Bishop Hobart withdrawing all opposition ; and that, *at some future period*, application should be made for the General Seminary.

This Agreement would have been acted on, and now in force, had it not been superseded by a subsequent Agreement, which embraced also the object of Bishop Brownell ; in order that each of the American Objects might receive the present countenance and support of the friends, in this country, of the American Church.

The Critic might not, indeed, know of this " Minute of Agreement ;" and when he was inveighing so unjustly against Bishop Chase, Bishop Hobart was absent from England : but, under the exercise of common justice and candour, he would not have hazarded these accusations without the fullest proofs and the most pressing necessity.

The other part of this objection—that Bishop Chase gives no pledge of pursuing, in the Ohio Seminary, the course adopted in the General Seminary—is as utterly unfounded.

The Declaration before quoted, by which " the General Seminary, or the Bishops as a Committee of that Body," were allowed a Visitatorial Power over the School, was before the Critic's eyes. It is difficult to account for such an accusation, under such circumstances. Prejudice and passion rarely blind men so completely to a sense of what their own character demands from them.

Your Lordship knows that every wish and act of Bishop Chase have been in conformity with this pledge. A passage in the Statement relative to the Ohio Seminary, circulated in the name of your Lordship and the other Trustees, is so decisive on this subject, that, for the benefit of the reader, I shall quote it on this occasion :—

But while the very existence of the Protestant Episcopal Church westward of the Alleghany Mountains thus absolutely requires the means of educating on the spot Young Men for the Ministry, Bishop Chase has manifested the utmost anxiety to preserve the authority of the House of Bishops, and the just and salutary control of the "General Theological Seminary ;" as will appear by the following Extract from the Deed of Constitution, signed by him in November, 1823, as the basis of all donations : viz.—

" That all Acts and Proceedings of the said School or Theological Seminary shall for ever be in conformity to the Doctrine, Discipline, Constitution, and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and to the Course of Study prescribed, or to be prescribed, by the Bishops of the said Church ; and on proper evidence of a default thereof, that the Right Rev. the Bishops of the said American Church, or a majority of them, as a Committee of the incorporated Institution of the General Theological Seminary of the said Church, in the city of New-York, or elsewhere, shall have power to institute an inquiry at law, and to see that the will and intentions of the Founders and Donors of the said School or Theological Seminary in Ohio be fulfilled."

It is observable, My Lord, that Bishop Chase here places the Ohio Seminary with respect to security for its principles, on the same footing as the General Seminary itself. In the 2d Article of the Constitution of that Seminary, the trustees are authorized to prescribe the course of study, with the rules and regulations for the government of the Seminary, and to take the requisite measures for its prosperity, under the following provision—

That such rules and regulations, and course of study, and measures, be not repugnant to the Constitution and Canons of the Church, and to the Course of Study for Candidates for Orders, which is or may be established by the House of Bishops.

We shall hear no more, then, My Lord, of this unfounded charge : nor would it ever have been made, if the Critic had given himself time to understand the case ; and had sought that temper, with which he ought to have entered on the fearful responsibility of censuring his superiors.

But several weighty reasons offer themselves, My Lord, which may induce the hope, for the sake of the general interests of the American Church, that no Seminary in the Western Territory will take the name of *Branch* to the General Seminary ; which name should be confined to those Schools, over which the Trustees can exercise an intelligent superintendence, and in which that superintendence may be advantageously allowed by the parties more immediately concerned in the School. As a sincere friend to the Unity of the Church, I earnestly hope that a wiser and more expanded policy will be acted on, than would be implied in the General Seminary extending its *Branches* (in the usual acceptation of the term) into the wilderness of the Western Territory. It is at this moment in the power of the American Church, with that prospective wisdom which ought to mark the designs and measures of Christian Communities, to provide for the establishment of the Church to the utmost extent of the Territory of the United States, and yet maintain it one and undivided. A *Branch* School (in its usual and proper acceptation) implies a degree of dependence, which, however practicable and expedient it may be, in cases where the Branch School can secure a proper representation of its interests, and the Parent Seminary can exercise an intelligent and salutary control, would be injurious where distance or other circumstances prevent the attainment of these objects. It is not at all probable, that any one of the Atlantic Dioceses (that of New-York excepted, and for the reason before assigned) will give up its right to establish Diocesan Schools: and this right will be the more resolutely maintained, because the more needed, in proportion to the distance from the General Seminary. What then is the true course to be pursued ? Bishop Chase has pointed it out. I have no difficulty in believing, My Lord, after all the calumnies heaped on the head of this devoted Friend of the Church of which he is so distinguished a Member, that he will in the end have eminently contributed, if his example be followed, to keep the Church in one compact and united body, however far she may extend her borders. Diocesan Seminaries, such as are or may be established, are not necessarily in any connexion with the General Seminary, nor even under the authority of the House of Bishops ; and have, therefore, no such strict bond of union with the Church at large, as that which Bishop Chase has proposed with respect to the Ohio Seminary. That Seminary will differ from all other Diocesan Seminaries, in being placed under the Visitatorial Authority of the House of Bishops, as a Committee of the General Theological Seminary. The House of Bishops can possess and exercise such power, by the Laws of the States, only as acting under a Corporate Body ; and the General Convention itself is not such a body, while the General Theological Seminary is such. Let, then, such of the Atlantic Dioceses as choose to exercise the right of having Diocesan Seminaries place them, in the same manner, in connexion with the Church ; and let any future Seminaries in the Western Territory follow the same example : and should the increase of population and wealth beyond the mountains require a Western General Theological Seminary, let that Seminary act in the same manner toward all the Diocesan Schools which may be formed beyond the mountains—the House of Bishops exercising a Visitatorial Power over the Diocesan Schools east of the mountains, as a Committee of the Eastern General Seminary ; and over those west of the mountains, as a Committee of the Western General Seminary—both the General Seminaries and all the Diocesan Schools being thus placed under that only control—the House of Bishops

—which will then be found practicable, and which will constitute the proper centre of union throughout the whole Church. Nothing can stand in the way of this arrangement, but narrow-minded views and local feelings : but it is to be hoped that these will be abandoned. If not, the time will come, when the Church will, in all probability, become unmanageable ; and will fall to pieces, for want of that system of direction, which will alone satisfy its various portions, and unite them in one willing and effective band.

Many points in this case, My Lord, have been slightly touched, and others have been wholly avoided ; all of which would, when rightly stated, have strengthened the plea of Bishop Chase ; but this course has been pursued, in order to enter as little as possible on matters which it is understood that the parties concerned are desirous of burying in oblivion.

The cause of Ohio has, therefore, been vindicated in this Letter, only so far as the necessity of the case seemed to require. *Whether any further vindication may become necessary will depend on circumstances.* I do hope that it will not, either in this country or in America : but I wish to apprise its friends in America, that there are in reserve materials in this country for a history of every step in the transactions ; not one of which on the part of their venerable Bishop, they would wish, in their most calm and deliberate judgment, to have been otherwise than it has been. He will return from among us, venerated and beloved by all who have had the privilege of knowing him and his proceedings ; and leaving a deep impression on our minds, of the blessing which that distant branch of the Episcopal Church enjoys in possessing such an Ecclesiastical Governor. Our Sister Church has been raised by him in the esteem of great numbers among us ; and he has taught us to value more highly than ever the Liturgy and Institutions which we have the happiness to possess in common. And, in his personal character, as an humble, and devout, and self-denying Christian, he has given us an example of “ suffering affliction and of patience,” under trials appointed of God and provocations endured at the hand of man, the recollection of which will be cherished by many, to their lasting encouragement in the Christian warfare.

The spirit which Bishop Chase has manifested in this country, and the corresponding temper discovered by his own flock in America, are strikingly exhibited in the following extract from the Cincinnati Letter before quoted :—

We could wish that this controversy might be soon buried in oblivion. We earnestly hope that we may not be called to contribute further to its existence. Our Bishop writing from London on the 22d November, thus expresses himself :—“ Bishop Hobart must surely think that what he is doing is right. I will not reproach him. On the contrary, most devoutly do I pray for his health and happiness. And if he is wrong (and the All-wise God knoweth whether he is so or not,) most humbly do I implore mercy for him, even as I would desire mercy for myself, should I be in the wrong.” We will ourselves endeavour to adopt these sentiments, and we earnestly recommend them to the adoption of others.

Thus Bishop Chase felt and wrote, when Bishop Hobart was avowedly opposing his measures. Your Lordship *knows*, that since their Agreement, often referred to, he has cherished the same spirit of peace. To the honour of Bishop Hobart, I also state that I know of no instance of his violating the Agreement, and I believe that he will entirely disapprove of the violation of it by others.

But what report, My Lord, will these venerable Prelates of the Ame-

rican Church have to make to their confidential friends, on their return home from their visit to that Church, in which they have been accustomed to rejoice as the honoured Parent of their own? Thus much I am compelled by truth to say, that they have both lamented to me, and deeply lamented, that spirit which tends to division, and have spoken most honourably of the healing spirit which has aimed at concord. But while the Sermons of Bishop Hobart published in this country may serve as Guides to our Clergy in their pulpit instructions, and the intercourse of Bishop Chase with numbers among us may serve to awaken a veneration for our Discipline and our Liturgy not felt before, let us not suffer these venerable Prelates to return home with the feeling, that they have witnessed in the Church which they have acknowledged as a Mother, those symptoms of decrepitude and imbecility which too surely mark the approach of dissolution.

Of the truth of the character which I have given of Bishop Hobart's Sermons, the Members of the Church have the means of judging. What I have said of Bishop Chase's influence among us requires some explanation: and I speak from information, of the truth of which I have no doubt, when I say that his visit has been the occasion of profit to many. I quote from the Letter of a sincere Christian and acute observer, at one of the cities which Bishop Chase has visited—

I hope we shall all be the better for such a primitive example, and love our Liturgy more than ever. We have had an assemblage of our Sunday-School gratuitous Teachers, to receive a Lecture from the Bishop on the best way of instructing the Scholars in the right use and improvement of the Book of Common Prayer.

But the visit of these prelates to this country has already been productive, in another respect, of advantage to the Established Church; which is, I trust, but the prelude to greater benefits of the same kind yet to follow, and which will more than counteract the results of that dividing and really schismatical spirit which gave occasion to this address to your Lordship. Many truly pious members of the Church, who had not been accustomed to meet or act together, and who under early associations and misconceptions had felt some mutual alienation of mind, have been brought to act in concert toward the common end of assisting their American Brethren. The very difficulties in the way of adjusting the apparently conflicting claims of those Brethren, have given occasion to the exercise of mutual candour and good-will among their respective friends. Every thing was in the fair way of knitting together in unwonted bonds of esteem and regard, many Churchmen who had hitherto but little known and understood one another. But the turbulent and restless spirit, which had occasioned the chief difficulties to such good understanding, bursts forth again with violence. The American Church, by her representatives in this country, may open her grateful hand, to receive, from English affection, assistance in her different plans and cares for the common good—the Heads of the British Church may cordially engage their aid in this cause—and the Nobles and Clergy and other Liberal Benefactors of our country may pour in their contributions: all this shall weigh nothing against the dogmatizing spirit, which lays claim to a keener penetration into the Church's interests and paramount devotion to her anuthority, while the real object of its veneration is its own imagined infallibility.—How deplorable is the proof of this, afforded by the article which has called for these animadversions! This writer has before him, by his own acknowledgment, a List of Subscriptions to the Ohio Seminary, which same paper announced your Lord-

ship, Dr. Gaskin, and Mr. Henry Hoare as joint Trustees with Lord Gambier of the Fund raising for this Seminary, and contained, moreover, the following declaration :—

The friends of this measure are happy to add, that all the Heads of the Established Church of this Country, who have yet been applied to, including the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of London, Durham, St. David's, and Lichfield and Coventry, have fully sanctioned the measure, and promised their support—

and yet, as no true Churchman would have done, he suppresses all these names, and endeavours, in defiance of what he knew to be the fact, to fix an odium on the measure, as resting only on the recommendation of the Noble Person whom, for that purpose, he had laboured to vilify.

A venerable Prelate, visiting our country under circumstances which would have called forth from every sincere Churchman the most kind and respectful consideration of his case, and the most reluctant and soothing refusal of his plea, if, after unwearied attempts to admit its force, the mind could not be brought to assent to it—this venerable Prelate is rudely charged with want of “modesty and prudence,” in urging a “preposterous, unreasonable, and impracticable request,” in behalf of some unknown Academy, to be erected in unknown lands, conducted upon unknown principles, and superintended by unknown managers”—while, on the contrary, his whole plan has been opened with fidelity and clearness, and his cause pleaded with distinguished meekness and simplicity. He is charged with disingenuousness in concealing the fact that the American Church discountenanced his scheme—whereas it is not a fact that the American Church has discountenanced it; and, so far as the disapprobation or doubts of any of its individual Members had reached Bishop Chase, he had, in the most candid and manly manner, given circulation to their opinions. He is charged with suppressing an important Letter from Bishop White, which proves to be of no importance at all—his objections to Bishop Chase's measures having been otherwise made known. He is charged with gross misrepresentation in appealing to a Resolution of the House of Bishops as in force, which has been repealed—whereas that Resolution is still in force, and has not been repealed! He is charged with having deserved these reproaches, by a total change of principles and conduct, at the hand of the same Reviewer, who, in 1822, held him up as an object of admiration—whereas the change is wholly in the party accusing; who seeks to excuse his own contradiction of his predecessor in office, by these gross calumnies on one who has ever remained the same consistent and dignified Member of his Church. He is charged with a design “to alter the character of the American Church, and exchange Episcopalian Clergymen for Methodist Preachers,” on the ground that he declined establishing a Seminary in connexion with the General Seminary, and would not thus give any pledge that he would adopt the course of studies adopted in that Seminary—whereas, in the most explicit manner, the Bishop has connected his Seminary with the General Seminary, and has placed its course of studies under that very authority which directs and controls those of the General Seminary.

But is that good understanding among the Members of the Church which the visit of these Prelates has contributed so greatly to increase, likely to be arrested by this repulsive display? On the contrary, My Lord, I can say, of my own knowledge, that it has already produced an opposite effect. It is clearly seen that the character of these statements, and the spirit which dictated them, are utterly alien from the temper

and principles of the Members of the Established Church. When the Editor of a Periodical Work cherishes feelings and publishes opinions which are repugnant to those of the great body of the persons whose sentiments his work is supposed to represent, he deprives that work of all the authority attached to it as the representative of such body. The imposing word "we" loses all its magical power; and the reader, if he be not, unhappily, one of the few who may be cast in the same mould, refers, with a degree of resentment which he ever afterward associates with the work itself, all the responsibility of such a breach of public trust to the Editor and the Writer. And when the minds of thinking and candid readers are thus led insensibly to reduce all the authority of such opinions and statements to one or two individuals, with what indignation do they view these men scattering firebrands, arrows, and death around them!—maligning the motives and measures of the Prelates of other Churches; and sneering at the Prelates of their own Church, as "seduced" into the support of a plan one object of which is to "exchange Episcopal Clergymen for Methodist Preachers"—as calling, therefore, for the interference of these persons to "open their eyes"—and as exciting "the astonishment and incredulity of future historians" that they had been "aiding and abetting" in an "attack upon American Episcopalianism," by reducing the future Clergy to the rank of "the primitive Methodists and modern Ranters."

No, My Lord, there is no respectable portion of the United Church which will not read these calumnies with disgust, and despise this arrogant spirit of dictation from one or two individuals. The British Critic has done itself irreparable injury by the admission of such an article; and will henceforth be considered, on questions of this nature, as the vehicle of private feelings and individual opinions. The sincere Members of the United Church imbibe too much of her benignant and enlarged spirit to endure such intolerance and bad temper—and, while the works which are imbued with this spirit pass, with all their high pretensions, into merited neglect and oblivion, those which foster and promote her own charitable temper will continue to rise in the public esteem.

I have the honour to remain, My Lord,

With great respect,

Your Lordship's most faithful Servant,

A CHURCHMAN.

London, June 18th, 1824.

J. & J. HARPER, PRINTERS, N. Y.

10689568901



Duke University Libraries